DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 849 SP 028 881

AUTHOR Watras, Joseph; Lasley, Thomas J.
TITLE What Should Teacher Educators Do? State Reform in the Context of a National Agenda for Change in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE May 87
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Ohio Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Columbus, OH, April, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Educational Change; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; Statewide Planning; Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS Call for Change in Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Although educational reform for teacher education has been called for in many recent reports, educational reformers typically do not take time to define exactly what is to be changed, why, and how that change can be evaluated. Many of the conceptions for change are narrowly defined and vary among reports. Seven recommendations made by the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education report, "A Call for Change in Teacher Education," are delineated and discussed in terms of the varied and sometimes conflicting values set forth in such blueprints for educational reform. It is concluded that the report is a conservative document because it extends practices generally employed in schools of education. Unfortunately, the desire to increase competence as measured by standardized tests or by performance in traditional courses will work against the aim of bringing in new people with new ways of looking at the world. Whatever reform takes place at the state level should be done with this observation in mind. The key is to move reform in a way that truly balances conflicting needs. This cannot be accomplished through precipitous action or short-sighted legislative mandates. True reform will occur only through thoughtful dialogue, cautious optimism, and actions that are shaped through a merging of experience and research. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED282849

What Should Teacher Educators Do? State Reform in the Context of a National Agenda for Change in Teacher Education

Joseph Watras
Associate Professor
Department of Teacher Education
University of Dayton

Thomas J. Lasley
Associate Professor and Chair
Department of Teacher Education
University of Dayton

May 1987

Paper presented at the Ohio Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, April 1987, in Columbus, Ohio.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Watras

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 028 881

What Should Teacher Educators Do?
State Reform in the Context of a National Agenda for Change in Teacher Education

The reform of teacher education is one of the dominant themes of the education literature of the 1980s. In general, those arguing for change share a common view. They hold that the teacher training programs now in practice should be lengthened, that prospective teachers should be tested more rigorously before they enter teacher education programs, and that the requirements now in force should be strengthened. Unfortunately, if the substance of these reports is accepted uncritically, teacher educators may act to make two goals, competence and pluralism, mutually exclusive. All schools need competent teachers, but the wish to ensure that a school's faculty reflects the society's cultural diversity may be a contradictory aim. The problem is that a teacher education program may define competence by using measures that tend to restrict the types of people who can pass the tests. As a result, the desire for strict standards can obscure the need for pluralism.

Part of the problem is that these two goals, competence and pluralism, are elusive. It is not clear what a teacher should be competent in doing. Nor can one say easily or surely what evidence will show that someone is a competent teacher. For example, it might be that a teacher who can construct situations

wherein the students learn to apply information to problems is unable to march children through a textbook because of his or her desire to grapple with real life situations. While such a teacher may be praised for encouraging children to think, the same teacher may be blamed for not helping the students excel on achievement tests.

Similarly, the definition of pluralism is hard to pin down. It can mean being sure that representative numbers of minority group members or people of both genders or those physically handicapped are included as faculty and as students. Or pluralism may refer to diversity in ways of speaking or of thinking or of acting among faculty and students. Or pluralism could refer to something as vague as ensuring that among the faculty and students one could find spokespeople for several different philosophies of education.

Unfortunately, educational reformers do not take the time to define these ends or any other that they pursue. This was true in 1943 when Jacques Maritian complained that American educators spent enormous energy perfecting means to reach superficially examined ends (p. 3). It is true today. The authors of national reports on the future of education often try to map out programs which they say will make teachers more competent, but these same reformers do not define sufficiently what this means. At the same time, their efforts are tilted towards such a narrow conception of competence that they exclude pluralism or an understanding of

either good. An example of this is found in A Call for Change in Teacher Education (National Commission, 1985).

A Call For Change in Teacher Education is a response, in part, to the report entitled A Nation at Risk (National Commission, 1983). In 1984, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education created the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. Funded, in part, by the U.S. Department of Education, this Commission heard testimony from May 1984 through January 1985. During this period, the Commission met three times, held five two-day hearings in different places around the country, heard the testimony of 70 witnesses, and solicited 30 papers from educational experts. In February 1985, the Commission released its report, A Call For Change in Teacher Education. The report was intended for policymakers, educators, and private citizens and focused on change in teacher education policy and practice.

The Commission made sixteen suggestions to improve the profession of education. Those recommendations were divided into five categories: supply of teachers, quality of teacher education programs, accountability for teacher education, resources for teacher education, and support of high quality teaching. Seven of the sixteen recommendations are particularly important because they illustrate the uneven consideration paid to the conflicting goals of competence and pluralism. The thrust of this paper is to examine those seven recommendations and

to assess their validity for policymaking on a statewide or at an institutional level.

The Supply of Teachers

RECOMMENDATION I: ADMISSION TO AND GRADUATION FROM TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD BE BASED UPON RIGOROUS ACADEMIC AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS. The Commission (1985) defined these standards by dividing them into three categories:

> First, before admission . . ., every candidate should demonstrate above average collegiate scholarship, good critical thinking skills, and competence in communication skills . . .. Second, before . . . student teaching, every candidate should demonstrate mastery of . . . the subject to be taught and the pedagogical foundations that underlie effective teaching. Third, before graduation . . ., every candidate should . . . demonstrate his or her knowledge and skills on three measures: (a) a test of knowledge of the subject to be taught, (b) a test of knowledge and application of the foundations, science, and processes of teaching, and (c) ability to teach effectively. (p. 8)

Such a recommendation is based on the commonsense notion that test results effectively measure an individual's ability to perform certain teaching-related tasks. The tests the Commission recommends cover the various skills an individual should be able to exhibit or know in order to be a good teacher. Testing is not the problem. The difficulty is with how tests are used to meet policy mandates. The reasoning in one research paper (Galambos, 1986) solicited by the Commission illustrates this problem.

Galambos (1986) draws upon the earlier work of Coleman to describe how the verbal ability of teachers (presumably as

measured by tests) is an important variable in explaining student learning. Such evidence, concludes Galambos, suggests that "testing prospective teachers on their knowledge of English is likely to contribute to the improvement of student learning" (p. 154). But when she considers specific tests, such as the National Teachers Examination, Galambos notes that there does not seem to be a relationship between one's scores and one's performance as a teacher.

If testing of language skills is reasonable, what level of performance should be considered essential for success? Few studies provide direction. Galambos asserts that the states that have adopted skills tests do so using political, not empirical data. Hence if states have a few teachers to fill many slots, the state boards of education may set the passing scores to allow low ability candidates to pass easily; when they have many candidates to fill a few slots, the test scores are adjusted upward.

Leach and Solomon (1986) describe the way Georgia uses tests as part of the certification process and as part of their staff development. They say, "The certification examinations are job related to the public schools . . . they are a test of grade level subject matter" (p. 164). In addition, the teachers go through an on-the-job assessment. "The teacher is provided opportunities to demonstrate proficiency on all 14 competencies necessary to convert to the renewable Performance-based Teaching

certificate." When evaluating the effect of the program, Solomon and Leach say ". . . 6000 Georgia educators have been involved in the assessment of the beginning teachers." Evidently the authors had the results of an opinion survey taken from this group because they made the following remarks: "Beginning teachers considered the information provided at their orientation adequate. . .. During their interview, they felt that there was an effort to put them at ease. . .." And, "Peer teachers and administrators said that their participation in the assessment process gave them a better awareness of the basic skills of teaching and that their school system used the results for teacher growth" (p. 171). Nonetheless, the vague nature of these judgments indicates that anyone who worked on the assessment program spent more care devising the tests and finding ways to administer them than they spent thinking about what the tests measured. The authors end their evaluation with the following statement: "We believe that teachers in Georgia classrooms today are better prepared than ever before and that they are the key to significantly improved student performance we have seen in recent years" (p. 171). However, it would be difficult to explain the basis of this statement to a critic.

Do tests reduce the hope of attaining a pluralistic teaching force? One answer is that they seem to exclude members of minority groups. Galambos (1986) points out that "the failure rate among

black candidates [is] as high as two thirds, while white applicants fail at a much lower rate" (p. 158). She notes a similar problem for Hispanics, but she is cautiously optimistic that this problem will be resolved as standards are tightened in the schools where the future teachers study and as tests are appropriately validated. Unfortunately, there is no reason to think the passing scores on such skill tests will remain static and thereby allow previously disenfranchised groups to catch up. As everyone's score improves, passing scores may climb, and although the minority group members' performances on the tests may get better, they may still fail in comparison to other candidates. Each school might be careful to ensure its tests do not exclude some ethnic groups, or a school might give minority students special attention when they apply. But these steps will not eliminate the problem. It is systemic and requires complex and long-ranging responses.

A second way the tests could hurt is if they too narrowly define the qualities being assessed. For example, the Pre-Professional Skills Test of the Educational Testing Service is a test that measures reading comprehension, mathematics, and writing abilities. These timed tests are used by a variety of Ohio institutions to measure basic skills. What institutional representatives often fail to take into account is the task-specific nature of the PPST testing. The writing section of the PPST measures an individual's ability to compose in a short time

period an essay to develop a composition that reflects proper use of grammar and an ability to write with a specific aim. It does not take into account editing skills or an individual's ability to reorder sentences or paragraphs. Indeed, at one institution (A. Kimbrough, personal communication, 1987) the scores of all students who failed the PPST were analyzed with regard to performance in English composition classes. Almost without exception the students performed well in the composition classes, even when they took those classes from demanding graders. What the PPST measured was different in nature and form from what the English faculty was teaching: the former stressed impromptu writing skills; the latter emphasized writing and rewriting to compose an essay.

The result is that the educators who want to use the PPST to screen prospective teachers may create a misleading definition of competence required of teachers and thereby reduce the variety of writing styles found among teachers. It would be a misleading conception of competence because there is no evidence showing that teachers should master the type of writing the PPST measures. It might be a better practice for teachers to get into the habit of editing and carefully rewriting all messages including notes to parents rather than to hone their impromptu writing skills. But when all candidates must take the PPST, careful authors who love to polish every sentence may appear to be unfit to be teachers. Consequently, the goals of competence

and pluralism could be harmed.

In fairness to the commissioners, they recognized that a strict set of standards might reduce the number of teachers and, therefore, the differences among them unless the pool of applicants grew. Consequently, the second recommendation they made was the following: THE STATES, IN CONCERT WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, SHOULD LAUNCH A NATIONWIDE CAMPAIGN TO RECRUIT QUALIFIED CANDIDATES INTO THE TEACHING PROFESSION. Furthermore, their third recommendation went as follows: SPECIAL PROGRAMS SHOULD BE DEVELOPED TO ATTRACT CAPABLE MINORITY CANDIDATES.

The commissioners demand that standards must not be lowered, but rather that incentives have to be raised. These incentives to attract more qualified candidates of every ethnic background may include scholarships, graduate fellowships, and forgivable loans to academically talented students. Unfortunately by saying it is a problem of money, teacher educators may not realize that their own policies in schools of education keep minority group members out. As a result, educators devise a multitude of incentive plans to lure prospective minority minority students to the teaching profession, but the solution may be far simpler and cheaper. They can do this in two ways. The first is the use of community colleges (see Haberman, in press). The population of most community colleges consists of students who cannot afford or who simply do not feel comfortable

in a four-year institution. What teacher educators need to do is reach out to this population, to go to them rather than to expect minority students to come to schools of education. Second, the faculty ranks of institutions need to be altered to reflect a greater percentage of minority faculty--something easier to say than to do. Still, through the use of adjunct faculty, a wider range of collegiate role models emerges. Admittedly this would be easier to achieve in metropolitan areas, and though it may relegate minority faculty to a lower status non-tenured track, such a practice is a beginning.

Programs for Teacher Education

A fourth recommendation the Commission made is EACH TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD BE AN EXACTING, INTELLECTUALLY CHALLENGING INTEGRATION OF LIBERAL STUDIES, SUBJECT SPECIALIZATION FROM WHICH SCHOOL CURRICULA ARE DRAWN, AND CONTENT AND SKILLS OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION. The members on the commission split on this issue. The body of the report indicates this recommendation will require longer programs than are now generally required. In a footnote, nine members assert that the commission should have been more forthright about two issues: The first is that all prospective teachers should be educated in one academic major; the second is that teacher education programs should take five years to complete.

Why did the Commission split over the question of recommending a five year program? Perhaps the answer is that the split is

more apparent than real despite the recognition that extending the programs of teacher preparation would shrink the schools and make it even harder for minority group members to enter. The Commission did say that more than four years would be necessary to accomplish program purposes. Two essays by Andrew (1986) and Scannell (1986) in the background papers describe five-year programs. These programs illustrate that educators may choose to extend teacher education courses without fully considering what this does.

Andrew (1986) describes the events leading up to the adoption of a five-year teacher education program at the University of New Hampshire. Unfortunately, his essay is uncritical in that it tends to explain rather than analyze. Andrew does acknowledge that student enrollment declined by 50% when the program began in 1973, and he sees encouragement in the fact that enrollment has steadily improved from matriculating 40 students in 1975 to nearly 80 prospective teachers in 1984. Andrew is convinced the five-year plan is successful because the students' academic characteristics are what he calls outstanding: "Not only do they represent a group academically far superior to prospective teachers described in national summaries, they also represent significantly better than average senior students at the University of New Hampshire and are comparable to all graduate students at that institution" (p. 79). He determines this by looking at grade point averages and scores on the Graduate Record

Examination. Andrew does not compare these students' abilities as teachers to those of previous graduates, but he does note that 90% of the graduates of the five-year program obtain a job teaching and they seem to have a strong commitment to teaching. Still, quality comes at a price. As Andrew points out, "We cannot realistically expect that large numbers of outstanding college students will pay for an extended teacher preparation program with the prospects of a relatively low salary in return. . .. Good candidates. . . choose the fifth year of our program because a paid internship or scholarship is available. Many do not finish because funds are not available" (p. 83).

Scannell (1986) described a five-year plan at the University of Kansas. Like Andrew's, Scannell's paper is more explicative than analytical. For example, Scannell notes the School of Education at the University engaged in a self study that resulted in a concept paper. The concept paper, Scannell says, described a program that would give prospective teachers self understanding, human relation skills, knowledge of human growth and development, curriculum planning skills, and liberal arts training. While the time this program would take to complete was not clearly stated, Scannell says it would take more than four years.

Both the New Hampshire and Kansas programs are illustrative of the disposition to act first and evaluate later--a phenomenon not new to education or to teacher education. Scannell does note

that "preliminary studies suggest that the students are performing better academically than did students in the now discontinued four year program" (p. 98). But, we also learn the students' scores on the ACT are higher and the number of students in the program is considerably less.

Common sense says that a good student will be a good teacher. Therefore, if the extended program makes better students as measured by reliable tests than the schools of education should adopt them. The flaw in such reasoning is that the abilities a student demonstrates are not the abilities a teacher needs. There is some overlap, but later teaching ability is not so closely tied to undergraduate student performance that the costs associated with extending the program are reasonable. Those costs are high.

First, if the number of students in these longer programs are smaller, the expense of educating teachers will increase. Large institutions will not be able to matriculate hundreds or thousands of students. If the students entering must have higher ACT scores, fewer members of minority groups who traditionally do not do as well on such tests may be allowed to work towards certification. And if students must forego a salary while seeking the extra year of preparation, those people who need money will be forced to withdraw. The result is that, once again, an unclear notion of competence may reduce the pluralism available to a school or college.

The fourth recommendation suggests the importance of an integrated liberal arts and professional education program. Commission members state that "teachers should have a liberal education equivalent to that of the best educated members of their community. . . should know and understand the intellectual and practical content from which school curricula drawn . . . and have the skills to teach" (p. 14 National Commission, 1985). They went on to say that the program must be coherent and its intellectual demands high. How can one develop such a plan or what does it look like? The commissioners did not say. In the background papers, though, Jones (1986) provides suggestions on how a school of education might attain these ends. Jones notes that the call for teacher education to be an all university responsibility usually takes two forms. The first form necessitates defining clearer responsibility for both the liberal arts and the education faculty. More and better accountability is required for each group.

The other alternative, which is the one Jones favors, is an integrated school:

> The courses about human learning and the social and psychological forces that affect it as well as those in methods of teaching and their appropriateness for particular age groups and particular types of learners coexist in a special way with those in subjects to be taught in the schools in the education of teachers. (Jones, 1986, p. 51)

This is no easy task. Jones says a curricular structure will not provide the answer if the faculty who teach the courses

are not committed to the concept. She gives six ways to bring this about. The first is exhortation by university presidents to encourage the best students to enter teacher education. The second is some form of joint committee to oversee cooperative course offerings. The third is having teacher education and liberal arts faculty define the common body of skills and knowledge they must pass on to students. The fourth is having the two groups of faculty share the responsibility for screening students for admission into the program of teacher education. The fifth is having the university reward faculty who cooperate with such an aim. Finally, deans of education will have to take on broad concerns and be supported in these endeavors.

Unfortunately, Jones does not tell us why these steps and not other acts are necessary. Nor does she tell us how these administrative forms will cause a change. Her ideas are prescriptive but lack evidence. And there is reason to think her suggestion poses threats as well as possibilities.

The faculty at a midwestern university are trying to accomplish Jones' third aim. Faculty members from the liberal arts college who teach selected liberal arts core courses are meeting with faculty from the school of education to discuss ways the liberal arts courses can be coordinated with the professional education classes. This process has only begun, although some liberal arts faculty have worked together in what is called the CORE program for two years. Judging from the experience of these

people, there are some problems. First, the program may tend to reduce the variety of teachers to whom a student is exposed because only faculty who are compatible and flexible can work together. This might be to the good if only cooperative and flexible teachers were needed in today's schools. However, schools need teachers who do not fit into such a mold in order to reach those students who have similar outlooks themselves. Further, the effort to provide coherence to the program could turn the liberal arts courses into professional ones. That is, the history courses could overemphasize educational changes or philosophy courses could use issues drawn from schools to serve as topics of discussion. Consequently, the desire to show coherence among the studies and thereby improve the future competence of the student may narrow the young persons' interests more than is healthy.

The National Commission's fifth recommendation was: FOLLOWING THEIR COMPLETION OF A TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM AND THE AWARDING OF A PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATE, NEW TEACHERS SHOULD COMPLETE AN INDUCTION PERIOD OR INTERNSHIP OF AT LEAST A YEAR'S DURATION FOR WHICH COMPENSATION IS PROVIDED.

The Commission's aim here is to provide an opportunity for the new teacher to be "successfully immersed in the teaching profession" (p. 16). Such a proposal is a wise one if it seeks to correct what is often called "sink or swim" introduction to teaching wherein a new teacher is given all the responsibilities

a twenty-year veteran has and is expected to perform as well as the established teacher.

Griffin (1986) attempts to show what must be accomplished with new teachers and what administrative policies will work in achieving established goals. Griffin contends the most important thing we could do is to help the new teacher be reflective, deliberative, and collaborative. Although Griffin does not say why this list of attributes is any better than another list, he does assert that they are supported by research and personal testimony. He gives some suggestions to reach these goals. Griffin's lessons all point to setting up ways experienced teachers can help newer ones. It is reasonable to assume that when a neophyte feels welcome in the school context, then the newcomer will most likely do better work. But it is hard to see how this help from experienced teachers will make new teachers reflective or deliberative. Such help will certainly encourage collaboration and may well assist with some of the technical aspects of teaching, but critical reflectivity, which is an essential aspect of professionalism, will necessitate that mentors understand how to guide the practices of new teachers and how to have tyros challenge the assumptions undergirding those practices.

The recommendation regarding collaboration is important even if the program or the background papers are less than clear on how to accomplish it. Educational sociologists such as

Lortie have long pointed out that the conservative mindset of teachers is reinforced by the absence of some form of mediated entry into the field. The educational sociologists claim that the teacher has to work things out the best he or she can. And as Lortie (1975) points out, "Each teacher must laboriously construct ways of perceiving and interpreting what is significant. That is one of the costs of mutual isolation which attends the absence of a common technical culture" (p. 73). In other professions, Lortie notes, mediated entry is commonly found: "Typically the neophyte takes small steps from simple to more demanding tasks and from small to greater responsibility under the supervision of persons who have attained recognized position within the occupation" (p. 59).

One might think that since each new teacher constructs his or her own way of perceiving and interpreting, the schools are filled with a variety of teachers each with a different style. The opposite is the case. Thrown into a situation, fearful of making a misstep, the new teacher tends to imitate what other teachers do. The point here is that pluralism is achieved by making people as comfortable as possible and giving them a culture that supports experimentation. This implies that judgments about a young teacher's competence must be suspended somewhat as that newcomer's experiments are allowed to fail. This is a point the report tends to avoid.

Accountability for Teacher Education

The seventh recommendation of the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education is: CERTIFICATION AND PROGRAM APPROVAL STANDARDS AND DECISIONS CONTINUE TO BE STATE RESPONSIBILITIES IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PROFESSION. This recommendation is in accord with a preliminary observation of the authors of the Commission report. In a prefatory note the commissioners assert, "Although the federal government has a compelling interest in the well being of the nation's schools . . ., it has neither advocated nor prescribed curricula, and it has set no standards for teaching or for the schools. It should not do so" (p. 3). The commission stops short of this conclusion, and increased federal control is unlikely, but enhanced state control is now a reality. Ironically, in explaining the meaning of the recommendation, the authors say that what is needed is uniformity among state boards of education rather than diversity:

> States should insist on adherence to their certification process - that is, for example, state certification is based on approval of teacher education programs and a candidate should not be certified on the basis of a list of courses taken in another state when those courses do not meet the states' standards. States also should not issue emergency certificates if the candidates do not meet standards. (National Commission, 1985, p. 19)

The one focus the Commission wishes to impose is stated more directly in recommendation number nine: TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE LOCATED IN COLLEGES AND UNIVER-

SITIES. The point here is to avoid what are called "apprenticeship models" that allow students to take alternative routes to certification. The Commission report offers no evidence that teachers from colleges or schools of education are better than those prepared as liberal arts graduates. Such evidence in limited form does exist. For example, Ashton (in press) identified seven studies in which researchers examined the relationship of credits earned in professional education with subsequent positive classroom performance. In four of the seven studies (see Hice, 1970; Perkes, 1967; McNeil, 1974; and Taylor, 1957) student performance was influenced positively (i.e., students learned more) when they were taught by teachers who possessed requisite professional education coursework. Ashton's approach, and that of the researchers she cites, is an empirical one. Haberman (1986) provides less empirical and more philosophical arguments to show the superiority of trained teachers over un-trained ones. He begins with a brief historical overview outlining what he describes as the cyclic nature of educational reform wherein calls for excellence lead to increased attention to liberal arts courses for prospective teachers and calls for attention to special problem populations lead to increased attention to practical teacher education.

Haberman (1986) describes two important reasons why all prospective teachers should take courses in teacher education. The first of these is that if beginning teachers have thought

about schools in a systematic way (i.e., had professional education) they are more likely to profit from their teaching experiences than liberal arts graduates who have not encountered educational theory.

A second and more powerful rationale is derived from experiences that Haberman had on a task force of a Ford Foundation Great Cities Urban Teacher Education Project. He found liberal arts graduates could survive in city schools but they were less likely to relate positively to urban youths; they were, Haberman (1986) notes, "strong insensitives," (i.e., persons who had considerable disregard for the affective dimensions of teaching).

Despite these arguments in favor of teacher training for all prospective teachers, educators should remember two things. First, there is a long tradition that holds that the liberal arts contain the basis for the content teachers present to their classes and that the same liberal arts contain the foundation for any study of the methods and of the aims of education. Consequently, many respected scholars have held that careful attention to the liberal arts is enough. And the presence of such scholars on any elementary or secondary school faculty could provide a different orientation to the job, thereby redefining the competence of teachers while providing a new sense of pluralism. Second, teacher educators should remember that some special teachers, particularly those interested in the arts or the

crafts or the sciences, often come to teaching late as a result of discontent with their primary field of interest. These people are more subject matter oriented than most prospective teachers, but teacher educators should not inadvertently exclude such candidates by requiring that they fulfill all the prerequisites. This could happen if all students are forced to complete the same requirements for entry into the field as are the traditional preservice teachers.

Conditions Necessary to Support the Highest Quality Teaching

The thirteenth recommendation of A Call for Change in Teacher Education is that: TEACHERS SALARIES SHOULD BE INCREASED AT THE BEGINNING OF AND THROUGHOUT THEIR CAREERS TO LEVELS COMMENSURATE WITH OTHER PROFESSIONS REQUIRING COMPARABLE TRAINING AND EXPERTISE. The Commission said that "significantly improved salaries more than any other action, will encourage talented, highly qualified students to become teachers" (p. 26). And the Commission felt higher salaries would "do much to stem the exodus of highly qualified teachers into school administration or private enterprise." (p. 26). Again, the Commission does not offer evidence that pay increases will achieve excellence. Indeed, recent studies on why teaching is or is not an occupation of choice suggest that although pay is a factor in the selection of a profession, it is not the most important determinant. Robinson (1986) notes the National Educational Association policy calling for a

starting salary of no less than $24,000 per year with raises equivalent to those in comparable professions. But she gives no suggestions as to where these salaries will come from. Given the limited availability of resources (e.g., consider what has happened in states where governors proferred dramatic increases in education funding and have now "reconsidered" their proposals), it may be more efficacious to examine context factors than financial ones.

Lortie (1975) reports that few teachers cite money as part of the decision to enter the field. Generally, they say they want to provide service to others. Furthermore, Lortie points out that "viewed in the context of occupations with a large proportion of women, teaching salaries are not notably deficient, particularly when the relatively fewer working days per year are taken into account" (p. 30). Lortie adds a finding that would keep us from thinking that more money will bring more men into teaching. When he asked teachers about the benefits of teaching, the answers differed by gender. Fifty-four percent of the women and 39 percent of the men mentioned money as a factor. Nonetheless, Lortie contends that "income profiles of teachers are predictable, comparatively unstyled, and 'front loaded.' A beginning teacher knows what he will earn and can see that long service brings limited rewards" (p. 84). The lack of stages causes teachers to be present rather than future-oriented and to have a sense of "professional deprivation" if they persist and

work hard at their jobs, yet find that they are not moving ahead.

Lortie's findings are not universally accepted. Schwartz (1986) quotes a series of studies done on high school student interests. She says that, "when students who said they were not interested in teaching as a career were asked what would it take to change their minds, sixty percent responded that it would take considerably improved salaries" (p. 37).

It may be partially true that high salaries would attract better teachers. But such thinking may keep teacher educators from recognizing the multitude of other factors that draw people to the profession. The Commission may have overlooked other views because the authors of the report were more concerned with improving the competence of teachers than they were interested in addressing the need for a variety of personality types as teachers. Consequently, they tended to take a narrow view of the motives teachers have.

Conclusion

A Call for Change in Teacher Education is a conservative document in that it extends practices generally employed in schools of education. Unfortunately, the desire to increase competence as measured by standardized tests or by performance in traditional courses will work against the aim of bringing in new people with new ways of looking at the world. Whatever reform takes place at the state level should be done with this observation in mind.

The key is to move reform in a way that truly balances conflicting needs. That cannot be accomplished through precipitous action or short-sighted legislative mandates. True reform will occur only through thoughtful dialogue, cautious optimism, and actions that are shaped through a merging of experience and research. If the members of the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education help educators realize the need for careful deliberation over the aims and means of reform, they can consider their report to be a success. If it becomes a blueprint for action, the report will be a failure.

References

Andrew, M.D. (1986). Restructuring teacher education: The University of New Hampshire's Five-Year Program. In T. Lasley (Ed.), The dynamics of change in teacher education (pp. 59-88). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Ashton, P., & Crocker, L. (in press). Systematic study of plumed variations: The essential focus of teacher education reform. Journal of Teacher Education.

Galambos, E. (1986). Testing teachers for certification and recertification. In T. Lasley (Ed.), Issues in teacher education (pp. 153-162). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Griffin, G. (1986). Crossing the bridges: The first years of teaching. In T. Lasley (Ed.), The dynamics of change in teacher education (pp. 143-156). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Haberman, M. (1986). An evaluation of the rationale for required teacher education: Beginning teachers with and without teacher preparation. In T. Lasley (Ed.), Issues in teacher education (pp. 7-54). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Haberman, M. (in press). Recruiting and selecting teachers for urban schools.

Hice, J.E.L. (1970). The relationship between teacher characteristics and first-grade achievement. Dissertation Abstracts International, 31(08), 4036A.

Jones, L.B. (1986). Teacher education: An all-university responsibility. In T. Lasley (Ed.), The dynamics of change in teacher education (pp. 45-54). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Leach, J.W. & Solomon, L. (1986). Performance-based certification in Georgia: Present and future. In T. Lasley (Ed.), Issues in teacher education, (pp. 163-176). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

References (cont'd)

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maritain, J. (1943). Education at the crossroads. New Haven: Yale University Press.

McNeil, J.D. (1974). Who gets better results with young children--experienced teachers or novices? Elementary School Journal, 74, 447-451.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. (1985). A call for change in teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Perkes, V.A. (1967-1968). Junior high school science teacher preparation, teaching behavior, and student achievement. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 5(2), 121-126.

Popham, W.J. (1971). Performance tests of teaching proficiency: Rationale, development, and validation. American Educational Research Journal, 8(1), 105-117.

Robinson, S. (1986). Toward a more desirable profession. In T. Lasley (Ed.), Issues in teacher education (pp. 141-152). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Scannell, D. (1986). The University of Kansas extended teacher education program. In T. Lasley (Ed.), The dynamics of change in teacher education (pp. 89-100). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Schwartz, H. (1986). Recruitment, selection, retention, and graduation of teacher education students. In T. Lasley (Ed.), The dynamics of change in teacher education (pp. 29-44). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Taylor, T.W. (1957). A study to determine the relationships between growth in interest and achievement of high school students and science teacher attitudes, preparation and experience. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State College, Denton.